

Staff Recommendation to Allow Institutions to Propose New Credential Programs: Handbook Changes

April 2011

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents a revised Table 1 for Chapter 8 of the *Accreditation Handbook*. The table identifies the possible actions the COA may elect to take after an institution has hosted an accreditation site visit. In addition, the item clarifies that staff should decide, based on the standard findings in the report, if the template language allowing an institution to propose new credential programs should be included in the report.

Staff Recommendation

That the COA 1) adopt the revised Table 1, provided in Appendix B, to be included in Chapter 8 of the *Accreditation Handbook* and 2) direct staff to review the site visit reports and based on the content of the report decide if the standard template language “The institution be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation” should be retained or amended to “The institution not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.”

Background

The COA has developed an *Accreditation Handbook* (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook.html>) that clearly details the Commission’s policies related to accreditation and the implementation of those policies. In Chapter 8 of the *Accreditation Handbook* a table is presented which identifies the range of possible actions that the COA may take after an accreditation site visit. The table is reproduced in Appendix A.

The actions identified in Table 1 are options for the COA and the checkmarks indicate the actions the COA often takes for each of the four possible accreditation decisions but the COA is not restricted by the checkmarks in Table 1. The discussion at the March 2011 COA meeting clarified that the options in Table 1 were not logically sequenced and the COA decided to add some additional checkmarks. Staff has reorganized the options in the table such that the options move from least serious to more serious within each of the possible accreditation decisions. The COA may elect to place any stipulation on an institution even if it is not indicated in Table 1.

Proposing New Educator Preparation Programs

In all accreditation site visit reports there has been a standard section of language that follows the list of all approved educator preparation programs sponsored by the institution. This standard language is provided here:

Staff recommends that:

- The institution’s response to the preconditions be accepted.
- The institution be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- The institution continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

The language states that staff recommends these actions. After discussion with the COA at the March 2011 meeting, staff understands that it should review each site visit report and based on the content in the report decide which of the two options for the second recommendation should be included in the COA's report:

- The institution be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

Or

- The institution not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

Routinely the prohibition against proposing new credential programs is in a report if the team's accreditation recommendation is *Probationary Stipulations*. If a site visit team has recommended *Major Stipulations* and the standards that are less than fully met involve issues of institutional infrastructure, the Administrator of Accreditation would carefully review the team's findings and decide if the staff's recommendation about the ability of the institution to propose new educator preparation programs should be changed to a recommendation that the institution is prohibited from proposing new educator preparation programs. It is important to understand that no matter what the staff recommendation is, the COA is the entity that will decide if each institution is eligible to propose additional educator preparation programs while stipulations are in place on the institution.

Next Steps

If the COA takes action to adopt the revised table and directs staff to review the site visit reports for the appropriate recommendation related to the ability to propose new educator preparation programs, staff would update the *Accreditation Handbook* and Administrator of Accreditation would review all future site visit reports and decide which of the statements related to an institution proposing new educator preparation programs should be presented to the COA.

Appendix A

Table 1: Requirements the COA may impose as follow-up activities

Institution Actions Following an Accreditation Site Visit	Accreditation (✓ Indicates a possible follow-up activity)			
	Accreditation	with Stipulations	with Major Stipulations	with Probationary Stipulations
No required follow-up beyond the routine accreditation activities, i.e. Biennial Reports and Program Assessment.	✓			
Submit <i>Seventh Year Follow-up Report</i> addressing all identified area(s) of concern and/or questions.	✓			
Submit <i>Seventh Year Follow-up Report</i> addressing all stipulation(s), identified area(s) of concern and/or questions.		✓	✓	✓
Provide addendum to Biennial Report and Program Assessment documents addressing all stipulation(s), identified area(s) of concern and/or questions.			✓	✓
Submit periodic Follow-up Reports (30 days, 90 days, as determined by the COA) to ensure that appropriate action is being taken in a timely manner.			✓	✓
Re-visit by CTC staff and team lead.		✓	✓	✓
Re-visit by CTC staff, team lead, and 1 or more team members.			✓	✓
Institution notifies all current and prospective candidates of the institution's accreditation status.			✓	✓
Institution is prohibited from accepting new candidates in one or more programs until the stipulations have been removed.				✓
Institution is prohibited from proposing new programs until the stipulations have been removed.				✓

Appendix B: Proposed

Table 1: Requirements the COA may impose as follow-up activities

Institution Actions Following an Accreditation Site Visit	Accreditation (✓ Indicates a possible follow-up activity)			
	Accreditation	with Stipulations	with Major Stipulations	with Probationary Stipulations
No required follow-up beyond the routine accreditation activities, i.e. Biennial Reports and Program Assessment.	✓			
Submit <i>Seventh Year Follow-up Report</i> addressing all identified area(s) of concern and/or questions.	✓			
Provide addendum to Biennial Report and Program Assessment documents addressing all stipulation(s), identified area(s) of concern and/or questions.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Submit <i>Seventh Year Follow-up Report</i> addressing all stipulation(s), identified area(s) of concern and/or questions.		✓	✓	✓
Re-visit by CTC staff and team lead.		✓	✓	✓
Re-visit by CTC staff, team lead, and 1 or more team members.			✓	✓
Institution notifies all current and prospective candidates of the institution's accreditation status.			✓	✓
Submit periodic Follow-up Reports (30 days, 90 days, as determined by the COA) to ensure that appropriate action is being taken in a timely manner.			✓	✓
Institution is prohibited from proposing new programs until the stipulations have been removed.			✓	✓
Institution is prohibited from accepting new candidates in one or more programs until the stipulations have been removed.			✓	✓